


REMARKS

In an Office Action dated February 15, 2004, claim 1 was objected to because of an informality. Applicant has amended claim 1 to correct the informality.

In the Office Action, claim 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith et al. In particular, Figure 21 of Smith was identified as a spring including an aperture (in the direction of the longitudinal axis of the interconnect) that exceeded 50% of the width of the spring. In response, Applicant has amended the aperture of claim 26 to an aperture in which the entire perimeter of the aperture is completely surrounded by spring material. Smith does not show nor suggest an aperture in which the entire perimeter of the aperture is completely surrounded by spring material.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim as amended are allowable over the cited prior art reference, and allowance at Examiner's earliest convenience is hereby respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner believes a teleconference would facilitate prosecution, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Kent Chen
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 39,630
(310) 333-3663
February 15, 2005